

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–13 and 28–34. Claims 1, 8, and 28 are being amended to further recite the features of the invention. Claim 45 was previously canceled. Claims 14–27, 35–44, and 46–50 have been previously withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. As a result, claims 1–13 and 28–34 are pending for examination with claims 1, 8, and 28 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1–7 and 28–34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Richter et al (US 6,725,279) (“Richter”) in view of Fant et al (US 6,957,430) (“Fant”) and further in view of Zou et al (US 2004/0199652) (“Zou”). Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection. Even so, Applicants have amended the claims to further recite the features of the invention.

Independent **claim 1** has been amended to call for:

“...passing the multimedia data according to the implemented topology, the passing governed by the media processor wherein the media processor is responsible for all communications between the one or more multimedia components and wherein the multimedia data flows between the media processor and the one or more multimedia

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

components rather than directly between the one or more multimedia components themselves." (underlining added for emphasis)

Independent **claims 8 and 28** have been similarly amended. In support of the amendments, the original specification provides:

"...components referenced by a topology do not make calls to each other. Rather, media processor 220 is responsible for all communication. By having a centrally located communication method data flow is consistent, and there is greater interoperability between components." (portions para 35; emphasis added)

And more particularly:

"Data flows through the media foundation 200 by beginning with a media source 210 into media session 240 and then into media processor 220. From media processor 220 the data will flow into transforms 208 and back to media processor 220 one or more times. The data will then flow from media processor 220 into media session 240 and then into stream sinks 212." (portions para 27; emphasis added)

Richter may teach, "at least one communication bus to carry multimedia data flows between said multimedia processing blocks." (see Richter, col. 2, lines 21–22) But such a communications bus is not the same as Applicants' "media processor". Nor does Fant or Zou teach such a media processor or the like.

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

As such, neither Richter nor Fant nor Zou, separately or combined, teach, disclose, or suggest Applicants' claimed features, "wherein the media processor is responsible for all communications between the one or more multimedia components and wherein the multimedia data flows between the media processor and the one or more multimedia components rather than directly between the one or more multimedia components themselves."

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 28 are not anticipated by Richter under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) even in view of Fant and/or Zou. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2-7, 9-13, and 29-34 are each dependent on claim 1, 8, or 28. As such, each of claims 2-7, 9-13, and 29-34 is believed allowable at least in part based upon claim 1, 8, or 28.

Request for Reconsideration

Accordingly, reconsideration and examination of the above-referenced application is requested.

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Reply

Application Number: 10/603,328

Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: June 23, 2008

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 23, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Noemi Tovar

Reply
Application Number: 10/603,328
Attorney Docket Number: 302124.01